

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Elida Beauty US (IP) LLC v. WittRyan, Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-3733

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Elida Beauty US (IP) LLC, United States of America (“United States” or “US”), represented by Stobbs IP Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondents are WittRyan, United States, and Name Redacted¹.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <anyqtipsparadiseemporium.shop> and <qtipsfinding.shop> are registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 20, 2026. On August 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 21, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 24, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity

¹ This Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name <anyqtipsparadiseemporium.shop>. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name <anyqtipsparadiseemporium.shop>, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 28, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 31, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 20, 2026. A third party sent an email communication to the Center on September 5, 2026. The Center notified the Parties of the commencement of panel appointment on September 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Lynda J. Zadra-Symes as the sole panelist in this matter on October 5, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a limited liability company organized under the laws of Delaware, United States. It forms part of the broader Elida Beauty group.

Elida Beauty comprises a collection of approximately 28 established consumer brands, many of which have histories extending back more than a century. These brands span key personal care categories, including skin care, haircare and personal hygiene and include widely recognized names such as Alberto Balsam, Lever 2000, Q-tips and St Ives, among others.

Q-TIPS is one of the most well-known and longstanding brands within the Complainant’s portfolio. The brand traces its origins to 1923 and has been used continuously in connection with cotton swabs and related personal care products.

Q-TIPS branded products are distributed through a broad range of retail channels, including supermarkets, pharmacies, mass merchandise retailers, convenience stores and online marketplaces. The products are available through major national and international retailers, including Amazon and Walmart.

Over the course of more than a century, the brand has expanded beyond its original cotton swab product to include a range of specialized products for different consumer needs and applications. The Complainant actively promotes these alternative applications through its dedicated #QTIPSHACKS campaign which showcases innovative uses for Q-TIPS products, including household cleaning, beauty techniques, DIY projects, decorative arts, and everyday problem-solving solutions. The Complainant is also active on social media and has generated a significant level of endorsement with several hundred thousand followers on Facebook and other social media platforms.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the Q-TIPS brand, including, but not limited to the following:

US Registration No. 4233369
US Registration No. 1307624
US Registration No. 928702

Registered October 30, 2012
Registered December 4, 1984
Registered February 8, 1972

The disputed domain names were registered on May 9, 2026 and are both connected to the website located at “www.anyqtipsparadiseemporium.shop”.

The content visible on the website uses the Complainant's copyright-protected images and marketing materials. The website also references the Complainant's cotton swab products using Complainant's Q-TIPS trademark, as well as competitor products.

On July 10, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent associated with the disputed domain name <anyqtipsparadiseemporium.shop>. The Respondent did not reply to the letter.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names include Complainant's Q-TIPS mark, that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names and that the disputed domain names have been registered and used in bad faith.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. On September 5, 2026, an individual whose name and mailing address details appeared in the registrant information provided by the Registrar for the disputed domain name <anyqtipsparadiseemporium.shop> emailed the Center. He stated that he had received the Written Notice, but had not registered, owned, operated, or controlled the disputed domain names and had no knowledge of them. He further stated that the name and postal address shown were his, but the listed email address was not, and expressed concern that his personal information may have been used without authorization.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names are under the control of a common operator, based on commonalities between the disputed domain names, same registration date and Registrar, same privacy provider and the fact that the disputed domain name <qtipsfinding.shop> redirects to

the disputed domain name <anyqtipsparadiseemporium.shop>. Their overall use demonstrates that they are interconnected.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The addition of other terms “any,” “finding” and “paradiseemporium” do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the Complainant’s mark in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has never legitimately been known as Q-TIPS. The only reasonable conclusion is that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names to take advantage of the Complainant’s goodwill in the Q-TIPS brand and trademarks. There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is using the

disputed domain names legitimately or for noncommercial and fair use. The disputed domain names resolve to an online store which offers for sale the Complainant's Q-TIPS branded products and other competitor products at discounted prices. The online store does not disclose the lack of a relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant's trademark and products when registering and using the disputed domain names. This is demonstrated by the evidence of the Respondent's use of the Complainant's trademark and product images on its website and by the Respondent's offering of Complainant's products as well as competitor products for sale on its website. The evidence also indicates that the Respondent used the Complainant's mark in the disputed domain names to divert Internet traffic to the Respondent's own website. The Respondent also failed to respond to the Complainant's cease and desist letter.

The evidence in the case indicates that the Respondent's aim in registering and using the disputed domain names was to profit from or exploit the Complainant's trademark by directing Internet traffic to the Respondent's website.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain names <anyqtipsparadiseemporium.shop> and <qtipsfinding.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Lynda J. Zadra-Symes/

Lynda J. Zadra-Symes

Sole Panelist

Date: October 19, 2026